1 RICHARD M. FRANCO (CBN 170970) LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO 6500 Estates Drive Oakland, CA 94611 3 Ph: 510-684-1022 Email: rick@rfrancolaw.com 4 Attorney for Plaintiff 5 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC. 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 10 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER. Case No. INC., a non-profit California corporation. 11 Plaintiff, 12 VS. 13 HEALTH WARRIOR, INC., a Delaware 14 corporation. 15 Defendant. 16 17 18 19 20 INTRODUCTION 21 1. 22 23 24 25 26

ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY MAY 2 1 2018

SUE PESKO

RG18905593

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES

Health & Safety Code §25249.5, et sea.

Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("PLAINTIFF" or "ERC") brings this action in the interests of the general public and, on information and belief, hereby alleges:

This action seeks to remedy the continuing failure of Defendant HEALTH WARRIOR, INC. ("HEALTH WARRIOR" or "DEFENDANT") to warn consumers in California that they are being exposed to lead, a substance known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm. DEFENDANT manufactures, packages, distributes, markets, and/or sells in California the following products containing lead

(collectively, the "PRODUCTS"):

- Health Warrior Superfood Protein Bar Dark Chocolate Coconut Sea Salt (lead)
- Health Warrior Chia Bar Superfood Banana Nut (lead)
- Health Warrior Chia Bar Superfood Dark Chocolate Cherry (lead)
- Lead (hereinafter, the "LISTED CHEMICAL") is a substance known to the
 State¹ of California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.
- 3. The ingestion of the PRODUCTS causes exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL at levels requiring a "clear and reasonable warning" under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code ("H&S Code") §25249.5, et seq. (also known as "Proposition 65"). DEFENDANT has failed to provide the health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.
- 4. DEFENDANT's past and continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing, and/or sales of the PRODUCTS without the required health hazard warnings, causes or threatens to cause individuals to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL that violate or threaten to violate Proposition 65.
- 5. PLAINTIFF seeks injunctive relief enjoining DEFENDANT from the continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing, and/or sales of the PRODUCTS in California without provision of clear and reasonable warnings regarding the risks of cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm posed by exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL through the ingestion of the PRODUCTS. PLAINTIFF seeks an injunctive order compelling DEFENDANT to bring its business practices into compliance with Proposition 65 by providing a clear and reasonable warning to each individual who has been and who in the future may be exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the ingestion of the PRODUCTS. PLAINTIFF also

All statutory and regulatory references herein are to California law, unless otherwise specified.

seeks an order compelling DEFENDANT to identify and locate each individual person who in the past has purchased the PRODUCTS, and to provide to each such purchaser a clear and reasonable warning that ingestion of the PRODUCTS will cause exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL.

6. In addition to injunctive relief, PLAINTIFF seeks an assessment of civil penalties up to the maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per exposure authorized by Proposition 65 to remedy DEFENDANT's failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANT because, based on information and belief, DEFENDANT is a business having sufficient minimum contacts with California, or otherwise intentionally availing itself of the California market through the manufacture, distribution and sale of the PRODUCTS in the State of California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- Venue in this action is proper in the Alameda Superior Court because the
 DEFENDANT has violated or threatens to violate California law in the County of Alameda.
- 10. On March 9, 2018, PLAINTIFF sent a 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65
 Violation to the requisite public enforcement agencies and to HEALTH WARRIOR. The
 Notice was issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of H&S Code
 §25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations regarding the notice of the violations to
 be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violators. The Notice included,

25

26

inter alia, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing individuals; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations, including the chemicals involved, the route of toxic exposure, and the specific product or type of product causing the violations, and was issued as follows:

- DEFENDANT was provided a copy of the Notice by Certified Mail.
- b. DEFENDANT was provided a copy of a document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary," which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR §25903.
- The California Attorney General was provided a copy of the Notice via online submission.
- d. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by the attorney for the noticing parties, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(h) (2).
- e. The district attorneys, city attorneys or prosecutors of each jurisdiction within which the PRODUCTS are offered for sale within California were provided with a copy of the Notice pursuant to H&S Code § 25249.7(d)(1).
- 11. At least 60-days have elapsed since PLAINTIFF sent the Notice to DEFENDANT. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code §25249.5, et seq. against DEFENDANT based on the allegations herein.

PARTIES

PLAINTIFF ERC is a non-profit corporation organized under California's

Corporation Law. ERC is dedicated to, among other causes, reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic substances, consumer protection, worker safety, and corporate responsibility.

- ERC is a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25118 and brings this
 enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(d).
- 14. DEFENDANT HEALTH WARRIOR, INC. is a corporation organized under the State of Delaware's Corporation Law and is a person doing business within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11.
- 15. DEFENDANT has manufactured, packaged, distributed, marketed, and /or sold the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California and the County of Alameda. ERC is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that DEFENDANT continues to manufacture, package, distribute, market and/or sell the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California and in Alameda County. DEFENDANT knows and intends that the PRODUCTS are distributed, marketed and sold to consumers in California.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 16. The People of the State of California have declared in Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65).
- 17. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code §25249.6 states, in pertinent part:

No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual....

18. "Knowingly' refers only to knowledge of the fact that a discharge of, release of,

 or exposure to a chemical listed pursuant to Section 25249.8(a) of the Act is occurring. No knowledge that the discharge, release or exposure is unlawful is required." (27 California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 25102(n).)

19. Proposition 65 provides that any "person who violates or threatens to violate" the statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code §25249.7). The phrase "threaten to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur" (H&S Code §25249.11(e)). Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of the Act. (H&S Code §25249.7.)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 20. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed the chemical lead as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead became subject to the warning requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on February 27, 1988. (27 CCR § 25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.5, et seq.). Due to the high toxicity of lead, the maximum allowable dose level (MADL) for lead is 0.5 μg/day (micrograms a day) for reproductive toxicity. (27 CCR § 25805(b).)
- 21. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed the chemicals lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became subject to the warning requirement one year later and were therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on October 1, 1993 (27 CCR § 25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.6 et seq.). Due to the carcinogenicity of lead, the no significant risk level for lead is 15 μg/day (micrograms a day). (27 CCR § 25705(b)(1).)
- 22. To test DEFENDANT's PRODUCTS for lead, PLAINTIFF hired a well-respected and accredited testing laboratory. The results of testing undertaken by PLAINTIFF of DEFENDANT's PRODUCTS show that the PRODUCTS tested were in violation of the 0.5 μg/day "safe harbor" daily dose limit for lead set forth in Proposition 65's regulations. It is

significant that people are being exposed to lead through ingestion as opposed to less harmful methods of exposure such as dermal exposure. Ingestion of lead produces higher exposure levels and health risks than dermal exposure to these chemicals.

- 23. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANT, therefore, has knowingly and intentionally exposed the consumers of the PRODUCTS to the LISTED CHEMICAL without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
- 24. The PRODUCTS have allegedly been sold by DEFENDANT for use in California since at least March 9, 2015. The PRODUCTS continue to be distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.
- 25. On March 9, 2018, ERC served DEFENDANT and each of the appropriate public enforcement agencies with a Proposition 65 Notice, a document entitled "Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5" that provided DEFENDANT and the public enforcement agencies with notice that DEFENDANT was in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn purchasers and individuals using the PRODUCTS that the ingestion of the PRODUCTS exposes them to lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity (a true and correct copy of the 60-Day Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference).
- 26. As a proximate result of acts by DEFENDANT, as a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11, individuals throughout the State of California, including in the County of Alameda, have been exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL without a clear and reasonable warning. The individuals subject to the illegal exposures include normal and foreseeable consumers of the PRODUCTS, as well as all other persons exposed to the PRODUCTS.

24 | ///

25 ///

26 ///

| | ///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in the March 9, 2018, Prop. 65 Notice)

Against DEFENDANT

- PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 26, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
- 28. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT, at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated or threatens to violate H&S Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who ingest the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice to the LISTED CHEMICAL, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 29. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANT has violated or threatens to violate H&S Code § 25249.6 and is therefore subject to an injunction ordering DEFENDANT to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future customers, and to provide warnings to DEFENDANT's past customers who purchased or ingested the PRODUCTS without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.
- An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by
 Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).
- 31. Continuing commission by DEFENDANT of the acts alleged above will irreparably harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANT, as set forth hereafter.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in PLAINTIFF's Notice)

Against DEFENDANT

- PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 31, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
- 33. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated H&S Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who ingest the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice to the LISTED CHEMICAL, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 34. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANT is liable, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation for each unlawful exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the PRODUCTS.

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANT, as set forth hereafter.

THE NEED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through
 as if set forth below.
- 36. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT has caused or threatens to cause irreparable harm for which there is no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law. In the absence of equitable relief, DEFENDANT will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause or threatening to cause consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through the ingestion of the PRODUCTS.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF accordingly prays for the following relief:

- A. a preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), enjoining DEFENDANT, its agents, employees, assigns, and all persons acting in concert or participating with DEFENDANT, from distributing or selling the PRODUCTS in California without first providing a clear and reasonable warning, within the meaning of Proposition 65, that the consumers of the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL;
- B. an injunctive order, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), compelling

 DEFENDANT to identify and locate each individual who has purchased the PRODUCTS since

 March 9, 2015, and to provide a warning to such person that ingestion of the PRODUCTS will

 expose the consumer to chemicals known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm;
- C. an assessment of civil penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), against DEFENDANT in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65;
- D. an award to PLAINTIFF of its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, as PLAINTIFF shall specify in further application to the Court; and,
 - E. such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

9 DATED: May 21, 2018

LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO

Richard M. Franco Attorney for Plaintiff

Environmental Research Center, Inc.

EXHIBIT A

LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO

6500 ESTATES DRIVE OAKLAND, CA 94611 510.684.1022 RICK@RFRANCOLAW.COM

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Current President or CEO Health Warrior, Inc. 1707 Summit Avenue Richmond, VA 23230

The Corporation Trust Company (Registered Agent for Health Warrior, Inc.) Corporation Trust Center 1209 N Orange Street Wilmington, DE 19801

Shane Emmett (Registered Agent for Health Warrior, Inc.) 1707 Summit Avenue Richmond, VA 23230

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Allison Haley, District Attorney Napa County 1127 First Street, Suite C Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202 Stockton, CA 95202 DAConsumer.Environmental@sicda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney San Luis Obispo County County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Office of the California Attorney General

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

District Attorneys of Select California Counties and Select City Attorneys (See Attached Certificate of Service)

Re: Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq.

Dear Addressees:

I represent the Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC") in connection with this Notice of Violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, which is codified at California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. and also referred to as Proposition 65.

ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

The name of the Company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violator") is:

Health Warrior, Inc.

The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemical in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. Health Warrior Superfood Protein Bar Dark Chocolate Coconut Sea Salt Lead
- 2. Health Warrior Chia Bar Superfood Banana Nut Lead
- 3. Health Warrior Chia Bar Superfood Dark Chocolate Cherry Lead

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

This letter is a notice to the Violator and the appropriate governmental authorities of the Proposition 65 violations concerning the listed products. This notice covers all violations of Proposition 65 involving the Violator currently known to ERC from the information now available. ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations. A summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with the copy of this letter to the Violator.

The Violator has manufactured, marketed, distributed, and/or sold the listed products, which has exposed and continues to expose numerous individuals within California to the identified chemical, lead. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products by consumers. The route of exposure to lead has been through ingestion. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to lead. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product's label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide an appropriate warning to persons ingesting these products that they are being exposed to lead. Each of these ongoing violations has occurred on every day since March 9, 2015, as well as every day since the products were introduced in the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users.

Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d) of the statute, ERC intends to file a citizen enforcement action sixty days after effective service of this notice unless the Violator agrees in an enforceable written instrument to: (1) reformulate the listed products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and my client's objectives in pursuing this notice, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution to this matter. Such resolution will avoid both further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical and expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall, and is located at 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. 619-500-3090. ERC has retained me in connection with this matter. We suggest that communications regarding this Notice of Violations should be directed to my attention at the above listed law office address and telephone number.

Sincerely,

Rick Franco

Attachments

Certificate of Merit Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Health Warrior, Inc. and its Registered Agents for Service of

Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Health Warrior, Inc.

I, Rick Franco, declare:

- This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
- 2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
- I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that are the subject of the notice.
- 4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: March 9, 2018

Rick Franco

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On March 9, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY" on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO Health Warrior, Inc. 1707 Summit Avenue Richmond, VA 23230

Shane Emmett (Registered Agent for Health Warrior, Inc.) 1707 Summit Avenue Richmond, VA 23230

The Corporation Trust Company (Registered Agent for Health Warrior, Inc.) Corporation Trust Center 1209 N Orange Street Wilmington, DE 19801

On March 9, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1) were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On March 9, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney Napa County 1127 First Street, Suite C Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202 Stockton, CA 95202 DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney San Luis Obispo County County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

On March 9, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a scaled envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on March 9, 2018, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody

Page 8

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street, Suite 202 Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive, Suite 245 Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County 346 Fifth Street Suite 101 Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Room 171 Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street 4th Floor Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County 940 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County P.O. Drawer D Independence, CA 93526

District Attorney, Kern 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230

Service List

District Attorney, Lake 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles County Hall of Justice 211 West Temple St., Ste 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center Drive. Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced 550 W. Main Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Nevada County 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County 401 West Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, San Benito 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San Bernardino County 303 West Third Street San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Diego 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

District Attorney, Shasta County 1355 West Street Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra County 100 Courthouse Square, 2nd Floor Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter County 463 2nd Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street, Suite 152 Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N. Main Street, Suite Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Diego City Attorney's Office 1200 3rd Avenue, Ste 1620 San Diego, CA 92101

San Francisco, City Attorney City Hall, Room 234 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL San Francisco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor San Jose, CA 95113